	Case 1:24-cv-00311-KES-SKO Docume	nt 13 Filed 12/20/24 Page 1 of 3
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ERICK DONTAY GRAYSON,	Case No.: 1:24-cv-00311-KES-SKO
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DEFERRING RULING ON FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO
13	V.	DISMISS ACTION FOR PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE TO OBEY COURT ORDERS AND
14	LAURA PEREZ, et al.,	FAILURE TO PROSECUTE
15	Defendants.	Doc. 12
16		
17	Plaintiff Erick Dontay Grayson is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil	
18 19	rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Docs. 1, 9. This matter was referred to a United	
20	States magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
21	On May 9, 2024, the assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff's complaint and found	
22	that it failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. Doc. 10 at 7. In the screening	
23	order, the magistrate judge provided plaintiff two options: "(1) file an amended complaint curing	
24	the deficiencies identified by the Court in this order, or (2) file a notice of voluntary dismissal"	
25	within twenty-one days. <i>Id.</i> at 8. Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint or notice of	
26	voluntary dismissal. See Docket. On June 11, 2024, the assigned magistrate judge recommended	
27	this action be dismissed for plaintiff's failure to obey court orders and failure to prosecute.	
28	Doc. 12. The findings and recommendations	were served on plaintiff and contained notice that

Case 1:24-cv-00311-KES-SKO Document 13 Filed 12/20/24 Page 2 of 3

any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen days of service. *Id.* at 4. Plaintiff did not file any objections, and the deadline to do so has passed. Nor has plaintiff otherwise communicated with the Court to date.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court conducted a de novo review of this case. The Court's May 9, 2024, initial screening order invited plaintiff to either amend his complaint or file a voluntary dismissal. Doc. 10 at 8. However, no option was afforded to plaintiff to stand on his initial complaint alleging Eighth Amendment violations against defendant. *Id*.

Accordingly, the Court defers its ruling on the findings and recommendations to provide plaintiff a **final** opportunity to notify the Court of his intent. Within thirty days of the date of service of this Order, plaintiff must: (1) file a notice stating his intention to stand on his initial complaint, Doc. 1, which may be subject to the recommendation of dismissal for the reasons stated in the screening order, Doc. 10; (2) file an amended complaint curing the deficiencies identified in the screening order, Doc. 10; or (3) voluntarily dismiss this action without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41.

16 ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

///

///

20

22

21 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

Case 1:24-cv-00311-KES-SKO Document 13 Filed 12/20/24 Page 3 of 3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: 1. Within thirty days of the date of service of this Order, plaintiff must: a. file a notice stating his intention to stand on his initial complaint, Doc. 1, which may be subject to the recommendation of dismissal for the reasons stated in the screening order; OR b. file an amended complaint curing the deficiencies stated in the screening order, Doc. 10; OR c. voluntarily dismiss this action without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41. 2. Failure to timely respond to this Order will result in the dismissal of this action. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: December 19, 2024